



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,963	03/27/2001	Klaus Lowack	GR 00 P 1583	9891
24131	7590	05/25/2004	EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, PA P O BOX 2480 HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			TALBOT, BRIAN K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,963

Applicant(s)

LOWACK ET AL.

Examiner

Brian K Talbot

Art Unit

1762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/19/04 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear when the step of "patterning the first layer occurs". Prior to or after the activating step? Clarification is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Boyko et al. (6,212,769) or Amelio et al. (4,448,804) or vice versa further in combination with Bickford et al. (5,800,858).

Arbach et al. (5,021,129) teaches applying an electroactive layer (32) and then another electroactive layer (34). Patterning of the second layer (34) is performed to form areas (36). These areas (36) are then activated by seeding and then metallized to form conductive traces (see abstract and col. 1- col. 2)

Arbach et al. (5,021,129) fails to teach “pretreating” the entire first layer with an activator which is liquid, a solution, gas or plasma prior to applying the second layer.

Boyko et al. (6,212,769) or Amelio et al. (4,448,804) teach roughening/conditioning the surface of a first dielectric layer prior to the application of a second dielectric layer. This roughening/conditioning improved the adherence of subsequent catalysts.

Therefore, it would have been within the skill of one practicing in the art to have modified Arbach et al. (5,021,129) process by implementing a “pretreatment step” as evidenced by either Boyko et al. (6,212,769) or Amelio et al. (4,448,804) because of the advantages associated with such a step, i.e. reducing the amount of seeding utilized and improving the adherence of the deposited seed.

In addition, it would have also been within the skill of one practicing in the art to have modified Boyko et al. (6,212,769) or Amelio et al. (4,448,804) process by forming and developing the second photoresist prior to applying the seed layer as evidenced by Arbach et al.

Art Unit: 1762

(5,021,129) because of the expectation of achieving similar results as well as the fact that the amount of seed material utilized could be reduced due to the smaller area for which the seed is applied, i.e. no waste of seed material.

Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Boyko et al. (6,212,769) or Amelio et al. (4,448,804) fail to teach the thickness of the dielectric films being not greater than 50 microns (about 2.1 mils).

Bickford et al. (5,800,858) teaches a similar process whereby the thickness of the polymer films are from 0.3 to 5 mils in thickness which are imaged, developed and seeded prior to metallization. More than one layer of the polymer can be utilized with the layers being of the same polymeric material.

Therefore, one skilled in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar success by modifying Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Boyko et al. (6,212,769) or Amelio et al. (4,448,804) process by utilizing the same polymeric material for the layers having a similar thickness as evidenced by Bickford et al. (5,800,858).

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/19/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1762

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (571) 272-1428. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (571) 272-1415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Brian K Talbot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1762

BKT